

Applicant : Tony Chun-Hung Huang et al.  
Serial No. : 09/813,243  
Filed : March 20, 2001  
Page : 11 of 15

Attorney's Docket No.: 17539-026001 / STL9923

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement sheets of drawings includes changes to FIGS. 5 and 8 and replace the original sheets including FIGS. 4-5 and 8-9, respectively.

In Figure 5, reference numbers 410 and 424 were changed to 412 and 430, respectively.

In Figure 8, in item 814, "A(N)" was changed to "B(N)" and "B(N)" was changed to "A(N)".

Attachments following last page of this Amendment:

Replacement Sheets (2 pages)

### REMARKS

In the non-final office action mailed June 4, 2004, the Examiner allowed claims 9-11 and 13, rejected claims 1-5, 7, 12, 14-15 and 19, and objected to claims 6, 8 and 16-18. The Examiner also objected to the Specification and Figures. However, the Examiner indicated that claims 2 and 12 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and that claims 6, 8 and 16-18 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. In response, Applicants amend claims 1, 4, 9, 12, 14, and 17-19, and cancel claims 2 and 15-16. As such, claims 1, 3-14, and 17-19 are pending. Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider claims 1, 3-8, 12, 14, and 17-19 in view of the amendments and the arguments below.

Upon reviewing the file, Applicants note that an initialed copy of the enclosed PTO Form 1449 that accompanied the Information Disclosure Statement filed March 20, 2001, has not been received. Applicants respectfully request that the initialed Form 1449 be returned to Applicants in the next communication, indicating that the references have been considered.

### ***Allowed Claims***

Applicants thank the Examiner for allowing claims 9-11 and 13.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter – Claims 14, 17 and 18***

The Examiner indicated that claims 6, 8 and 16-18 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 16 and 17 each depend from claim 15, which depends from claim 14. Pursuant to what the Examiner has already indicated to be allowable, Applicants have amended claim 14 to include all the limitations of claims 15 and 16. Accordingly, Applicants have also canceled claims 15 and 16, and have amended claim 17 to depend directly from claim 14. As such, amended claim 14 is now in form for allowance, as is dependent claim 17.

As originally filed, claim 18 depended from claims 14 and 15. Pursuant to what the Examiner has already indicated to be allowable, Applicants have rewritten claim 18 into independent form to include the limitations of claims 14 and 15. Accordingly, claim 18 is also now in form for allowance.

As such, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner allow claims 14, 17 and 18, as amended.

***Claim Rejection 35 U.S.C. § 112(2) – Claim 12***

The Examiner rejected claims 2 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicants regards as their invention. However, the Examiner indicated that both of these claims would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the stated rejections.

Applicants have incorporated the canceled subject matter into claim 1. Applicants have canceled claim 2 and amended the subject matter, now recited in claim 1, to clarify the meanings of N, F, and T, as required by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the subject matter of originally filed claim 2 is now allowable subject matter in claim 1.

Applicants have corrected a typographical error in claim 12 to provide proper antecedent basis, as required by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the subject matter of originally filed claim 12 is now in form for allowance.

***Claim Rejection 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) – Claims 1, 3-8 and 19***

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-5, 7, 14, 15 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hattangadi et al. The rejections of claim 14 and 15 have been addressed above.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the subject matter of originally-filed claim 2, which is allowable as discussed above. As such, claim 1 (as amended) is now in form for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner allow amended claim 1, as well as claims 3-8, which depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1.

Applicants have amended claim 19 to include the subject matter of originally-filed claim 2, which the Examiner has already indicated to be allowable in conjunction with claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner allow amended claim 19.

### ***Informalities***

In addition to the foregoing amendments, Applicants have amended claims 4, 9, 14, 17 and 18 to correct minor informalities. Applicants submit that these amendments introduce no new matter.

### ***Objections to the Specification***

Applicants have made the corrections to the specification as suggested by the Examiner in paragraph 7 of the Office Action.

In addition, Applicants have amended several paragraphs of the specification to correct typographical errors, including spelling, and to correct reference numerals associated with the figures, as suggested by the Examiner or identified by the Applicant. Applicants submit that these amendments are informal in nature and do not add new matter.

### ***Objections to the Drawings***

Applicants have made the corrections to the drawings as suggested by the Examiner in paragraph 8 of the Office Action.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicants submit that pending claims 1, 3-14 and 17-19 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner issue a timely Notice of Allowance in this case for all of these pending claims, and provide an initialed PTO-1449.

Applicants believe that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, and there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant : Tony Chun-Hung Huang et al.  
Serial No. : 09/813,243  
Filed : March 20, 2001  
Page : 15 of 15

Attorney's Docket No.: 17539-026001 / STL9923

Enclosed is a check for \$980 for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Nov. 23, 2004

Craig O. Thompson  
Craig O. Thompson  
Reg. No. 47,990

Fish & Richardson P.C., P.A.  
60 South Sixth Street  
Suite 3300  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
Telephone: (612) 335-5070  
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696